DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 764 SP 006 912

AUTHOR	Peeler, Thomas H.; Shapiro, Jerome R.
TITLE	A Focus on the Cooperative Reorganization of Pre-Service and In-Service Teacher Education Programs.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Assessment and Coordination.
PUB DATE	[71]
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; *Educational Innovation; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Innovation; *Preservice Education; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Herein are discussed the traditional model of local school development in preservice education, including its weaknesses; selected models of preservice education stressing local involvement, including the Florida Experimental Program in Elementary Education, the Cooperative Student Teacher Center Concept, the Mercer County Teacher Education Center, other variations on the traditional model, and the Model Teacher Education Project of the U.S. Office of Education; local school involvement in in-service education, both past and present; emerging trends of in-service education in the 1970s; and the reorganization of teacher education. (Editor)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081764

A FOCUS ON THE COOPERATIVE REORGANIZATION OF PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

THOMAS H. PEELER
DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

JEROME R. SHAPIRO
DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

SP 006 912

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LOCAL SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION: THE TRADITIONAL MODEL 5

Weaknesses in Traditional St dent Teaching Practices
Inadequacy of Methods Courses
Lack of Correlation Between Theory, and Practice
The Inadequacy of the Time Period
Lack of Control over Supervising Teacher Quality
Lack of Reality
Conclusion

III. SELECTED MODELS OF PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION STRESSING LOCAL INVOLVEMENT 21

The Florida Experimental Program in Elementary Education
The Cooperative Student Teacher Center Concept
Mercer County Teacher Education Center
Other Variations on the Traditional Model
Secondary Teacher Internship Program at U.C.L.A.
The Lincoln School Clinical Module Project
Florida Atlantic University - Dade County Teacher Education Project
School University Teacher Education Center
Teacher Corps
Policy of the Los Angeles City Schools Towards Teacher Preparations
Grand Valley State College Teacher Preparation Program
Cooperative Program - University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Ten Model Teacher Education Programs
Conclusion

Chapter

IV. LOCAL SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: THE PAST AND THE PRESENT 53

A Limited Focus on the Remediation of Teacher Deficiencies
Objectives of In-Service Programs Have Been Irrelevant to the Priority Needs of Teachers, Students, and the Community
A Lack of Accountability
Limited Clinical Exposure of In-Service Instructors
Lack of Cooperative Planning to Relate Pre-Service to In-Service Training
Failure to Take Advantage of Modern Communication Media
In-Service Programs Have Failed to Offer Adequate Incentives to the Tenured Teacher
Conclusion

V. EMERGING TRENDS OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION IN THE 1970'S 71

Building on Teacher Strengths
Maximizing Teacher Involvement
Project Bonus - Carroll County, Maryland
California Teacher Development Project
Jackson County, Colorado Micro-Teaching Program
Child Study Institute
T.T.T. Project
B-2 -- Teacher Training Modules
Differentiated Staffing and In-Service Education
Local and University Cooperation
Rockdale County, Georgia Project
River Rouge, Michigan Project
Philadelphia Teacher Center
Conclusion

VI. REORGANIZATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION 87

Prospectus for Model of Professional Educator Training
Introduction
Identification of Terms as Used in the Model of Professional Educator Training (MOPET)
Assessment of Needs
General Objectives
Philosophical Bases of MOPET
Program Provisions of MOPET
Conclusion

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of school accountability is definitely being stressed today not only in the educational literature, but in speeches and the popular press as well. Even President Nixon, in his Education Message (March 3, 1970), has stated that there is a need for teachers and administrators to be held accountable for their performance. School boards, government agencies, local agencies, and individual parents have all demanded that the relevance and effectiveness of curriculum and teaching methods be established.

Educators, as a professional group, have tended to react to criticisms of the profession by dismissing their accusers as laymen who lack knowledge of the field. However, to profit from this new era of accountability, it seems essential that educators reexamine the educational process, and specifically the teacher, often identified as the most crucial variable within this process. If teacher behavior is to change, then the methods and procedures for the education of teachers must also change.

There are various directions that the reorgani-

zation of teacher education could take and there are many elements of traditional programs that could be reviewed or even discarded. Perhaps the dichotomy between pre-service and in-service education could be eradicated. Teacher education might better be construed as an on-going process, responsive to need rather than tradition.

It might be that we can no longer afford the luxury of training teachers in the semi-vacuum of the university where the theoretical is often divorced from the practical. It could be that student teachers would profit from immersion in the real world of the public school before dealing with the abstract in the college classroom. Or perhaps a marriage of theory and practice in the clinical setting of the public school is the answer to the problems of teacher education.

It is certainly evident that the old patterns of teacher education no longer fit the demands of a changing society. Teachers are called upon to individualize instruction, yet the traditional model in which they are trained disregards their individuality. The typical teacher education program recognizes one hypothetical ideal teacher and with Procrustean logic attempts to mold all prospective teachers in this image.

There is no statistical evidence to prove that there is only one effective way to become a good teacher. Yet traditional teacher pre-service and in-service programs persist in this assumption. Why must pre-service education require that all students go through the same core curriculum at a university? Why must student teaching be a short and often unrelated adjunct to the teacher preparation program? Must in-service programs be an onerous duty thrust upon unwilling staff members or can they be creatively designed to foster the individual competencies of teachers dedicated to improving their professional expertise?

The past decades have produced a variety of bewildering changes, not all of them technological. There is no reason to suppose that in the decades ahead such rapid change will not continue. As the demands upon the school to keep pace with societal changes mount, the demands made upon teachers will also increase. New ways of coping with this phenomenon must be found and new directions in teacher education must be explored.

The time is ripe for the establishment of creative partnerships in the teacher education process. Local involvement in this process could prove to be a truly beneficial response to the call for accountability.

The intent of this paper is to explore pre-service and in-service education with specific reference to the local role.

Although not necessarily advocating a pre-service/in-service dichotomy, the two areas will often be treated separately here for purposes of explication. We will be discussing what has been done, what is being done, and what should be done in teacher education.

CHAPTER II

LOCAL SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION: THE TRADITIONAL MODEL

It is ironic that the public school, as the recipient of the graduates of teacher education institutions, has had only limited influence with these institutions in the developing of programs. Indeed, throughout the history of teacher education, the role of local schools in the training of future teachers can best be described as minimal.

In researching the involvement of local schools in pre-service education, the writer has focused on the decade of the sixties. However, if the decades of the forties and fifties had been included in the search, it is likely that the facts disclosed would not have differed significantly. It is clear that the influence of the local school on pre-service education has been, and remains, slight.

The extent of co-operation between the teacher training institution and the local school is typically confined to the matter of placement of student teachers. The college coordinator calls a principal or a central office administrator and indicates the number of student teachers available for placement. The administrator assigns these students to teachers who may or may not have indicated a desire to work

with interns. More importantly, these teachers may or may not have evidenced capability in training procedures. They may not have evidenced excellence or even adequacy in the art of teaching.

The college or university supervisor may make on-site visitations for the purpose of supervising the student teachers. Yet, the number of the e visits varies widely. More importantly, the effect of these visits varies. As conditions presently exist, the college's intern supervisor has little or no control over the behavior of the supervising teacher and the quality of the student teaching experience. Likewise, the public school and the supervising teacher have practically no control over the type of preparation the student teacher has undergone prior to reporting to the public school for practice teaching.

WEAKNESSES IN TRADITIONAL STUDENT TEACHING PRACTICES

The traditional student teaching model has constituted the only major degree of local school involvement in the pre-service education of teachers during the sixties. In an analysis of this traditional model, the following weakensses emerged:

1. The inadequacy of methods courses as they presently exist and as they relate to teaching

ublic schools.

2. The lack of correlation between the theory and practice phases of pre-service education.
3. The inadequacy of the time period allotted for the student teaching.
4. The lack of control over the quality of the supervising teacher
5. The lack of "reality" in the practice teaching phase of pre-service education.

INADEQUACY OF METHODS COURSES

As teacher preparation now generally exists, the prospective teacher enrolls in so-called "methods courses" before beginning student teaching. These courses emphasize the theoretical, often at the expense of the practical. Mulhern states that an educational theory that could be presented in methods courses is obviously lacking.[1] The need for such a theory can be appreciated when one observes teachers making avoidable errors, the results of which could have been predicted. This lack of theory also becomes obvious when teachers are encouraged to engage in self and peer evaluation. Mulhern states that it almost seems as if

---

1. John D. Mulhern, "The New Emphasis in Teaching," North Central Association Quarterly, XLII (Fall, 1967), 200-207.

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT
THAT WAS SUBMITTED BY THE CLEARINGHOUSE.

B. O. Smith, while advocating that the training institution and the school remain separate entities, stresses the need for more systematic presentations in theory courses.[1] He also stresses the importance of relating theoretical knowledge to behavioral situations. This leads to the next area of weakenss in the traditional model of teacher preparation.

LACK OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Brown investigated the consistency between what teachers profess to believe about teacher effectiveness and what these same teachers were observed to practice in their classrooms.[2] While Brown's study dealt specificially with Dewey's philosophy, his findings have applicability to the whole theory-practice dilemma. He discovered that while teachers tend to agree verbally with

---

1. B. Othanel Smith with Saul B. Cohen and Arthur Pearl, Teachers for the Real World, (Washington, D. C., Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969).

2. Bob Burton Brown, "Congruity of Student Teachers' Beliefs and Practices with Dewey's Philosophy," Education Forum, XXXIII (January, 1969) 163-168.

Dewey's suggestions as to what should take place in the classroom, they fail to use these practices in their teaching.

This suggests that a pre-service education model which isolates the theoretical will not produce the desired results in the practical realm. Ironically, in view of the study just cited, it was Dewey, himself, who over fifty years ago warned against the unhappy consequences of a failure to relate theory to practice.

The empirical evidence lends support to what educators have been saying for some time. There is an obvious disparity between theory as it is taught in a college classroom and practice in the actual school setting. This theory-practice gap may stem from the imprecise conceptions of the nature and goals of effective teaching. Studies by Bellack,[1] Ryan[2] and Flanders[3] reveal the importance of systematic appraisal of the teaching act.

If theory and practice should be related, then the

---

1. Arno A. Bellack and Joel Davity and others, The Language of the Classroom, (Columbia University, U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research, Project No. 1497, 1963).

2. David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal, (Washington, D. C. American Council on Education, 1960).

3. Ned A. Flanders, Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement: Studies in Interaction Analysis, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research, Project No. 397, 1960),

most productive phase of a teacher preparation program should be the student teaching experience. Unfortunately, this is not the usual case. The next two areas of weakness in the traditional teacher preparation program to be discussed pertain to this point.

THE INADEQUACY OF THE TIME PERIOD

The student teaching phase of teacher preparation programs generally involves a time period of from four weeks to one semester. Rarely does this period extend beyond a semester; complete waivers of the practice teaching requirement are not uncommon.

Student teachers often develop inaccurate perceptions about teaching from their truncated experience in the schools. Because of the time limitation, they may have no idea of what the first day of school is like; they may fail to appreciate the continuity in curriculum development; and they may have no time to become acquainted with varying grade levels or types of classes. During a short student teaching period, a prospective teacher may have the opportunity to observe only one teacher, the teacher to whom he is assigned.

Andrews, in his discussion of the initial preparation of the career teacher succinctly summarizes these limitations. "Present-day, terminal, one-shot student teaching can be demonstrated to be educationally psychologically, operationally and financially unsound."[1]

LACK OF CONTROL OVER SUPERVISING TEACHER QUALITY

Silberman has observed that,

> "Perhaps the weakest link in the chain of practice teaching, and the one that is most difficult to correct, is the public school teacher in whose classroom the student teacher does his practice teaching. A large body of experience corroborated by some research, indicates that this teacher exerts considerably more influence on the student teacher's style and approach than do his supervisors or the education professors under whom he has studied."[2]

Silberman notes that the student teacher, without adequate supervision and without a thorough grounding in the theory of teaching or learning by which he can judge and analyze the teaching behavior of the teacher with whom he is placed, naturally tends to imitate him.[3]

---

1. L. O. Andrews, "Initial Preparation of the Career Teacher", Educational Leadership, Vol. XXVII (March, 1970), 553-555.

2. Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, (New York: Random House, 1969), 458.

3. Ibid.

With a poor directing teacher, the results will inevitably be unfortunate.

Mulhern states that one of the serious problems facing teacher education is the failure to maintain the highest professional criteria in selecting the cooperating teacher in the public schools.[1] It is entirely possible that student teaching might be m re meaningful if we admitted that every teacher was not qualified to be a cooperating teacher.

Surveys of elementary and secondary principals who conduct extensive teaching programs in their schools also reveal that not every teacher has the appropriate disposition to work with inexperienced, young adults who need guidance, not criticism, in their formative experiences.[2]

The directing teacher may not allow the student teacher sufficient opportunity in which to practice his developing skills. Conversely, the cooperating teacher may offer little or no direction to the intern, forcing him to "sink or swim". In either of the above situations, the unfortunate but

---

1. Mulhern, loc. cit., p. 202.

2. As reported in interviews conducted by Dr. Thomas H. Peeler, (Director of Elementary Education, Northeast District, Dade County, Florida, 1971).

obvious result is that the student teacher derives little benefit from his practice teaching experience.

The responsibility for identifying those teachers proficient in relating to student teachers and for augmenting the quality and skills of these supervising teachers must rest in part with the local schools. As conditions presently exist, these directing teachers are not under the authority of the universities which supply the student teachers, but are responsible to the local school administration. By choosing which teachers will participate in the training of prospective teachers, the local school implicitly assumes the responsibility of guaranteeing their suitability for the task. Even if the university reserves the right of selection, the element of authority over the selected teachers' behavior in the classrooms still resides with the local school administration.

There exists yet another area of weakness in the traditional student teaching experience, one which could be characterized by its lack of relevance to the reality of teaching.

LACK OF REALITY

The National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth conducted a two year study which resulted in the publication, Teachers for the Real World.[1] The thesis of the report is that we need a systematic training program to prepare teachers to teach all children regardless of their cultural background or social origins. Smith concludes that the basic problem is that teachers are not adequately prepared in their field. Their education consists of theory that is vaguely related to their teaching, with little or no training in the actual subject matter they are going to teach; their practical classroom experience is not training, but rather learning by trial and error. Even in the more innovative programs where community experiences are included, these usually consist only of exposure to the community, not a systematic training program that will foster understanding.

Smith contends that the traditional program of teacher preparation equips the prospective teacher to perform very few specific tasks and to understand the situations he must deal with as a teacher only in the most superficial way.

---

1. B. O. Smith, loc. cit.

When the prospective teacher does get a chance to experience the reality of a classroom, other factors may militate against his developing a true picture of the nature of teaching. He may have to spend too great a proportion of his time in attempting to maintain the same evenness of control as formerly maintained by the cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher may even demand that discipline be the foremost concern of the intern.

The student teacher may be required by the university or the directing teacher to spend an inordinate amount of time writing unrealistic lesson plans which have little relation to his teaching. He may be required to devote more time to the development of these plans than actual teaching or interaction with children.

A further consideration is that the intern teacher may practice teach the way he believes that his supervisors wish him to. Because his student teaching will earn him a letter grade and will count towards his graduation from a university, a student teacher may not attempt innovative practices, preferring to remain in the safer area of the traditional. Or he may be "innovative" if that is what is expected by his university supervisors, reserving the right to try it his way once he is "really" teaching. In either case, the student is not practicing

what he will be doing, but only practicing conforming to temporary expectations.

CONCLUSION

Wilhelms states that over the years teacher education has been improved. He con ends, however, that it still suffers from its insistence on putting the theory first and the practice last.[1] , According to Wilhelms, it is from this one fallacy that the many serious consequences which plague all phases of the teacher education program arise. It serves to produce a callow beginning teacher, one who may soon become disillusioned with the profession. Wilhelms feels that this process is not inevitable, but remediable through alternative teacher education programs. He contends that an essential feature of such programs should be a better school-college partnership.

Combs states, "Some of the improvements we seek in education can be brought about by spending more money, by building better schools, by introducing new courses of

---

1. Fred T. Wilhelms, "Before the Beginning", Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (May, 1968), 137-143.

study, new standards or new equipment. But the really important changes will come about only as teachers change."[1] Because institutions are made up of people, it is teacher behavior that will ultimately determine the effectiveness of our schools. He feels that our teacher preparation programs are crucial and that a reorganization of them is critical if the educational process is to be improved.[2]

If Combs' thesis is correct, the involvement of the local school in the improvement of education becomes imperative. It may very well be that the preparation of teachers can best be accomplished within the public school classroom. It is certainly obvious that it is within the public school classroom that the end product of teacher education will either further the progress of education or retard its potential for benefiting our nation's children.

From a review of the literature, the necessity for greater cooperation between the public schools and universities is becoming evident. Most educators agree that internship is vitally important and that the extension of

---

1. Arthur W. Combs, The Professional Education of Teachers, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1965) p.v.

2. Ibid.

this phase of pre-service education would help to close the gap between theory and practice. However, they also agree that mere extension of the period of internship will not automatically produce highly competent professional teachers. The quality of the experience must also change; and it is here that local efforts could have a great and salutary effect.

Hayes, in his analysis of imperatives for student teaching, concurs with this viewpoint when he states, "For too long the profession has permitted the colleges to pay lip service to the pre-teaching laboratory experiences without demanding action to equal what has been stated."[1] He calls for local initiation of cooperatively developed new, more meaningful teacher education programs.

> "It is long past the time when we need to take the leadership to make student teaching what it must be. Our children need teachers. They deserve good ones. Good ones must have the best student teaching experience which we can provide."[2]

---

1. Robert B. Hayes, "Viewing Imperatives for Student Teaching in 1967," Teachers College Journal, XXXIX (October, 1967), p. 32.

2. Ibid, p. 35.

The programs referred to in the following chapter are attempts on the part of public schools and universities to rise to this challenge.

CHAPTER III

SELECTED MODELS OF PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION STRESSING LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

The preceding chapter concentrated on analyzing the traditional model of teacher education with particular emphasis on local involvement in the student teaching phase. The major weaknesses of the program as it generally exists were discussed under five headings:

1. The inadequacy of methods courses as they relate to teaching in the public schools.
2. The lack of correlation between the theory and practice phases of pre-service education.
3. The inadequacy of the time period allotted for student teaching.
4. The lack of control over the quality of the supervising teacher.
5. The lack of "reality" in the practice teaching phase of pre-service education.

Enlightened educators have attacked this traditional model and have begun to search for alternatives. Although the traditional model predominates, experimental programs have been developed which attempt to compensate for the

weaknesses. The basic changes which these programs call for are:

1. Greater emphasis on a merging of theory and practice.
2. Extension of the internship period with a minimum of one year being recommended.
3. Qualitative changes in the cognitive content of university course offerings in education.
4. Greater provision for suitability and applicability of content in teacher education programs.
5. Closer more productive cooperation between the university and the public school.

It is the intent of this chapter to outline various programs of teacher education which attempt to overcome the weaknesses of the traditional model. Programs which have been selected for review stress local involvement in the development and/or implementation phases. Although differences in emphasis on the other aforementioned factors may be noted among the programs presented, a high degree of cooperation between the university and the local school was the major criterion for inclusion in the present section.

THE FLORIDA EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Combs, in his book, The Professional Education of Teachers, looks at pre-service teacher education through a new set of glasses provided by current thinking in perceptual-existential psychology.[1] In 1968 the Elementary Education Department of the University of Florida, under Combs' direction, implemented a program designed to incorporate many of the book's suggestions.

This program[2] aims to accelerate change in teacher education and attempts to narrow the gap between theory and practice. As soon as the student enters the program, he is involved in some form of local school experience.

The organizing principles of the Florida Program are that one learns best when:

1. Learning is made personally meaningful and relevant.
2. Learning is adjusted to the rate and the needs of the individual.
3. Self direction is emphasized.
4. Theory and practice are closely related.

---

1. Combs, loc. cit.
2. As summarized by D. L. Avila, A. W. Combs, W. Olson, A. Packer and J. Shea in a mimeographed description of the Florida Experimental Program in Elementary Education.

The resulting structure has three parts, the first of which is the seminar. There are three seminars currently in operation consisting of one faculty member and thirty students each. After a student is assigned to one of these groups, he remains with it for the balance of the time he is enrolled in the program.

The functions of the seminar are as follows:

1. Through interaction with an empathic faculty member, and with his peers, a student's education experience becomes personalized and humanistic.
2. It serves as the place where the personal relevancy of the didactic aspects of the program can be realized.
3. It functions to maintain the individual records of the students.
4. It allows for the dissemination of information about forthcoming program acitivites as well as information concerning community events of particular interest.

The second part of the program is called the Substantive Panel. Faculty members of varying specialties which pertain to the curriculum in the elementary school help the seminar students to develop competencies in various areas. There is no course content in the usual sense. Students determine

how and how fast they will achieve competencies that have been determined by the panel on the basis of the students' entering proficiency. The panel members are available for small group and individual consultation with students.

The third part of the program, the field experience, relates directly to local involvement and contains some novel elements. A student immediately engages in some aspect of teaching upon entrance into the program. With his seminar leader he selects an appropriate level of experience.

Level 1: The first level combines classroom observation and individual tutoring in a local school. The time spent in observing may vary from four to ten weeks. Tutoring takes place one hour a week for at least ten weeks.

Level 2: At this level the student becomes a teacher assistant and participates in such activities as record keeping, small group work or individual tutoring.

Level 3: At this level the student becomes a teacher associate and assumes increasing responsibilities until he is able to take the class on a full time basis. It is at this level that the student fully develops

the competencies that have been pre-established for him.

An example of a minimum competency in the area of reading would require a student to properly administer an informal reading inventory and an interest inventory to several children. He would then write a report on each child stating what has been discovered about each child and what steps would be required for remediation.

The faculty members involved in the Florida Program feel that by subdividing methods courses into a series of competencies and by requiring students to work with children to achieve these competencies, a much more efficient program is provided - one that serves to bridge the gap between theory and practice.

A student receives two major evaluations, one midway through his program, the other at the end. This is done by a panel of staff members including one of the program co-directors, the student's seminar leader and one Substantive Panel member. This group considers all the information available on a student to assess his progress.

Some major advantages of the program appear to be:

1. Students are actively working with children in some stage of field experience for a period of approximately two years.

2. Courses are subdivided into a series of competencies. Students can work with children in completing each competency, thereby deriving a greater sense of its relevance to the teaching process.
3. Students can work at their own rate through the program, allowing for their individual differences.

Although the Florida model just described includes a degree of cooperation with the local schools not generally present in traditional programs for teacher education, it does not include a great degree of local participation in program development.

THE COOPERATIVE STUDENT TEACHER CENTER CONCEPT

An interesting emerging trend which demonstrates a high degree of local and university collaboration in the student teaching phase of teacher education is the Cooperative Student Teacher Center. VanderLinde defines a Cooperative Student Teaching Center as "a field unit for the supervision and instruction of student teachers and teacher interns".[1] He describes the center as generally

---

1. L. S. VanderLinde, "Cooperative Student Teaching Centers," in E. B. Smith, H. C. Olson, P. J. Johnson and C. Barbour, Editors, Partnership in Teacher Education, (Washington, D. C., The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966) p. 53.

consisting of fifteen or more student teaching stations located in nearby schools. The responsibility for developing and supervising the program is shared by the college and local school. Generally, some sort of committee or advisory board (reflecting this collaboration and its membership) is responsible for supervising and directing the student teaching phase. Membership on the committee may include only school and university personnel; or, in some cases, may include representatives of the community or the state board of certification.

There exists a great variety of organizational patterns in these centers, and differences can also be noted in many areas of operation. There are, however, commonalities that can be listed. VanderLinde describes these in terms of underlying assumptions and activities. From his survey of existing cooperative student teaching centers, he extracted some common specific objectives. These are as follows:

1. To foster communication between the local schools and the teacher training institution.
2. To expand the scope and the responsibility involved in decision making.
3. To make teacher preparation a matter of team work.

4. To facilitate more efficient procedures and policies through improved organization.
5. To establish ways of providing in-service education for supervisory personnel.
6. To provide an experimental setting for the analysis of teaching.

Those activities that he found common to the centers that he examined are as follows:

1. They are providing for cooperative training of local and university personnel in providing new directions for the laboratory phase of teacher preparation.
2. New types of administrative structures are being devised and new roles are being defined.
3. Lines of communication between the school and the university are being improved.
4. All the centers he surveyed are providing for pre-student teaching observation. Some are providing foundations and methods courses in an off-campus setting.
5. Centers are providing for innovation and experimentation in educational practices.
6. They are actively searching for new techniques and instruments for analyzing teaching.

VanderLinde raises some questions and issues that he feels need clarification if successful Cooperative Student Teaching Centers are to be established. These relate to the matters of control, role definition, scope and financing.[1]

MERCER COUNTY TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

A teacher education program which adheres to a center concept is the Mercer County Teacher Education Center.[2] This project revolves around a cooperative center organized and operated by Bluefield State College, Concord College, Mercer County Public Schools, and the West Virginia State Department of Education.

The Center was designed for the improvement of teacher education and grew from the following assumptions:

1. Teacher education preparation can be accomplished best in the "action" atmosphere of the public school and the local community.
2. For effective teacher education, cooperation between the university, county and local community is essential.

---

1. Ibid, p. 53-72.

2. "Mercer County Teacher Education Center," ERIC, ED. 046 868, May, 1971.

3. The public schools of the future will play a more active role in the preparation of teachers.
4. Teacher preparation should be based on educational experience modules, many of which will require on-site experience in the public school setting.
5. Local district staffs and college faculties have much to gain through joint in-service ventures.
6. The center concept offers many benefits to beginning teachers.
7. Graduate credit should be an integral component of continuing education.
8. The center concept, through its Advisory Committee, offers unique opportunities for control over the program.

The program as developed at the Mercer County Education Center (which was founded in July, 1969) incorporates a comprehensive approach to teacher education. It contains components designed for a pre-student teaching module, a student teaching laboratory and a program for continuing education for both beginning and experienced teachers.

At the heart of the program is the Advisory Committee. This committee includes representation from the institutions

of higher education, the West Virginia State Department of Education, Mercer County Administrative and Teaching Personnel, and the community at large. The committee is responsible for formulating Center policy, selecting a co-ordinator for the program and for providing general supervision.

OTHER VARIATIONS ON THE TRADITIONAL MODEL

SECONDARY TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM AT U. C. L. A.

A secondary pilot intern program was established at U. C. L. A. which concentrated on an introductory summer school program which indoctrinated interns gradually to the classroom setting.[1] Student teachers devoted four hours a day to practice teaching in the summer session at a local high school.

---

1. Jerry E. Wulk and Ralph M. Miller, "A New Approach at U. C. L. A: Secondary Teaching Internships," The Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965) 300-302.

The major difference between this program and more traditional internship programs appears to be the intensive summer program followed by a full year's salaried teaching position. During both phases of the program the interns were carefully supervised by experienced, cooperating public school teachers who were given released time in order to instruct and consult with the interns. In addition, a university supervisor visited the interns periodically. The major advantage gained through this program was the close working relationship that developed among the interns, university and public school personnel.

THE LINCOLN SCHOOL CLINICAL MODULE PROJECT

Goddu reports on a joint public school and teacher preparation project in Washington, D. C. in an article entitled "A Hope Lost at Birth."[1] The project points up the need for restructured roles if a university-school partnership is to succeed.

Essentially, the program combined university and public school personnel on a team. It was assumed that a team of trainers consisting of a clinical professor, a

---

1. Roland Goddu, "A Hope Lost at Birth," The Journal of Teacher Education, XXII (Summer, 1971), 199-204.

resident supervisor and selected teachers is essential for the development of training modules for prospective teachers. Although the theoretical assumptions for an optimum teacher training program appeared sound, the project very quickly ran into problems because of conflicting university and public school philosophies on the best approach to the teaching-learning act.

The divergence of training - researcher versus practitioner - created a hierarchy which placed the research college professor in a dominant position. This hierarchical movement did not facilitate compatibility or flexibility; it forced personnel to assert their expertise rather than to search for ways of combining abilities and talents.

As could be expected, the interns in the program became confused by a professional training team which could not agree on the process or structure of teacher education.

Ladd indicates that if schools and universities are to cooperate closely in the production of viable teacher education programs, each side will need to be well aware of some differences between the public school culture and the university culture.

"Leadership will emerge in both groups from those

who recognize and accept the subcultural differences and learn to work with them rather than against them."[1]

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY - DADE COUNTY TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT

During the 1970-71 school year the Northeast District of Dade County and Florida Atlantic University entered a cooperative teacher education program in two Northeast District Elementary Schools. This project was endorsed by Dr. E. L. Whigham, Superintendent of Schools, Dade County, Florida and Dr. Robert Wiegman, Dean of the School of Education, Florida Atlantic University. The basic design of this program evolved from a committee made up of the Northeast District Superintendent; Director of Elementary Education; two principals; two teachers; chairman of the student teaching department; Dean of the School of Education and the Director of the Dade Center, Florida Atlantic University.

A teaching team at each of the two elementary schools opted to take one less professional member for their team

---

1. Ernest T. Ladd, "Tensions in School-University Collaboration," in Partnership in Teacher Education, Ed. by E. Brooks Smith, et al (The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966) p. 104.

and use the professional salary to pay three Juniors and three Seniors for working 180 days on this team. Although the team had one less professional member, it was augmented by six university interns.

At the end of the first year of the program, teachers, administrators, university personnel and the university interns were in agreement that the program had the following advantages:

1. There was a greater degree of individualization for children primarily because of the additional help from the interns.
2. The Senior interns who worked full time for 180 days felt the year's internship had provided them with many opportunities for: improving the climate for learning; gaining greater knowledge in the use of a variety of different audio-visual materials and equipment; understanding of the process involved in individualizing instruction; and, understanding of the various learning styles of children.
3. The Junior interns who worked half time for 180 days felt the program provided them with an opportunity to: gradually become

involved with the various learning styles of children; use of a variety of materials; use varying teaching techniques; become actively involved in the teaching process without assuming overall responsibility for the total class.

Although the first year of the program was deemed highly successful by all involved, one of the glaring weaknesses was the fact that the students still had to take college courses on campus which seemed to perpetuate the theory-practice dichotomy which plagues traditional teacher education.

Near the end of the 1970-71 school year the decision was made by the Northeast District Superintendent, Dr. David N. Thomas and Dean Robert Wiegman to expand the program for the 1971-72 school year to thirty Juniors (working half-time for 180 days) and thirty Seniors (working full-time for 180 days) and to increase the number of participating schools from two to five.

In reorganizing the program the first major decision was to assign three Florida Atlantic University professors to the Northeast District Center schools. During the spring and summer the professors met with public school personnel in order to get feedback from teachers and administrators as to possible ways to restructure

courses for a more clinical approach.

During the summer of 1971 the teachers of Norwood Elementary (one of the five center schools) took part in a six-week summer training session which utilized both resident and non-resident consultants and which emphasized the following areas:

1. The use of the reciprocal category system and the Performance Assessment Record for Teachers. (Dr. B. B. Brown)
2. Applying Piagetian theory to practical classroom situations.
3. Numbers in Color.
4. Behavior modification techniques.
5. Use of Spalding's technique for systematic analysis of teacher-pupil classroom interaction.
6. Advanced Supervisory Techniques.[1]

The results of the training session will serve as a model for the remaining four schools, and workshops will be scheduled throughout the year with all public school teachers working in the F. A. U. - Northeast District program. The major thrust of the training session will be in the area of advanced supervisory techniques, the

---

1. Conducted by Dr. Joseph Shea, University of Florida, based on "Peer Supervision Process" developed by Dr. Daniel Nichalak, University of Indiana.

use of systematic observation, and the relation of theory to practice in classroom settings.

As the program enters the second year the cooperation between public school and university personnel remains high. Having university professors assigned and housed in the public schools is a unique and interesting concept. The success of this year's program will probably be [illegible].

1. How successfully the professors and public school teachers are able to operate as a team.
2. How sophisticated the professors can be in changing traditional courses to clinical practices in classroom settings. (In other words relating theory to practice.)
3. How successful a clinical approach to teacher education is as opposed to the campus setting for university students. (In this program, the F.A.U. students attend Miami-Dade Junior College and will, with the exception of eighteen hours of electives, complete all their remaining university work in a public school setting with public school teachers and university professors providing the instruction.)

4. How sophisticated the public school teachers can become in terms of advanced supervisory techniques, the relating of theory to practice, and learning to analyze teaching with systematic classroom observation techniques.

The evaluation design is being jointly developed by the Dade County Division of Research and personnel of Florida Atlantic University. Hopefully, by the end of the 1971-72 school year some objective data will be available which will determine the effectiveness of the program.[1]

SCHOOL UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

A program which appears to be working out a collaborative effort in teacher education is the School University Teacher Education Center[2] which is a jointly planned operation of the Board of Education of New York and the Department of Education of Queens College of

---

1. Additional information on this program can be obtained by contacting Dr. Thomas H. Peeler, Director of Elementary Education, 14027 N. E. 16th Court, North Miami, Florida 33161

2. Collaborative Effort of the SUTEC staff, "School University Teacher Education Center," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (February, 1967), 6-13.

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT
THAT WAS SUBMITTED BY THE CLEARINGHOUSE.

2. Pre-tenure teachers continue to be supervised by University and public school personnel until they are well equipped to serve as leaders in schools in disadvantaged areas of New York City.
3. The make-up of the advisory council provides the leadership often lacking in public school-university programs.
4. The program concentrates on developing professionals who have the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that will enable them to function in an effective, creative way. This requires an understanding of children in their in-and out-of-school experiences, the ability and freedom to create resources, and the ability to conceive of and respond to the changing role of the school within an urban setting.

TEACHER CORPS

One of the more innovative teacher preparation programs has been the Teacher Corps. The Corps was formed by a marriage of two separate bills. One, introduced by Senator Gaylord Nelson, was modeled on the Cardozo Peace Corps Program in Urban Teaching; the second was sponsored

by Senator Edward Kennedy, with its prime concern being the development of experienced teachers who could perform appropriately in disadvantaged areas.

Graham indicates that the Teacher Corps has provided interns with three experiences most beginning teachers do not have; actual experience in teaching disadvantaged children over an extended period of fourteen months to two years in their regular schools; personal knowledge of the particular disadvantaged community; and relevant university training closely tied to schools.[1]

There were at least fifty Teacher Corps Programs established across the nation with probably as many variations in each program. However, the major concern of all the programs was to prepare teachers to work in disadvantaged areas and hopefully to remain in these areas. Some evidence has been accumulated which indicates Teacher Corps personnel are remaining in the disadvantaged areas. The hiring and retaining of specially trained teachers should be a definite advantage to schools in the disadvantaged areas.

---

1. Richard Graham, "The Teacher Corps: A Place to Begin," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (October, 1968), 49-60.

POLICY OF LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS TOWARDS TEACHER PREPARATIONS

Cooperation with teacher education institutions in the preparation of teachers is an important policy of the Los Angeles city schools. Brown, Naslund, and Dederick[1] report the types of cooperative cooperation range from:

1. Long range recruitment in keeping teacher education institutions informed concerning teacher needs, fields of shortage, and special recruitment problems.
2. Evaluating and reporting to the college the success of new teachers.
3. Providing coordinators who jointly serve the school district and teacher education institutions. (The district pays the salary of these coordinators, one-half of which is reimbursed by the college involved. These coordinators help assign, supervise, and evaluate student teachers for the college and the school system.)

---

1. William R. Brown, Mildred Naslund, and Nellie Dederick, "Los Angeles City Schools - Partner in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, XII, (March, 1961),60-65

4. Assisting local colleges in determining the subject matter, background and professional skills needed by teachers.

This particular cooperative venture in preparing new teachers offers great hope for the future. Results achieved in recent years in the Los Angeles area provide convincing evidence of the value of partnership both for the public schools and for the teacher education institutions.

GRAND VALLEY STATE COLLEGE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

DeLong reports on a teacher preparation program at Grand Valley State College which appears to incorporate many worthwhile changes in a trend toward more cooperative ventures between public schools and universities.[1]

A major assumption in this program is that students can best discover and develop philosophies and methods for testing through direct participation in many phases of public school operation. Therefore, a ten week teacher aide program has been developed which allows university students to become familiar with students (kindergarten through twelve), and through participation to become

---

1. Greta DeLong, "Toward More Meaningful Teacher Preparation" Journal of Teacher Education, XII (Spring, 1971), 15-19.

familiar with the services of the school administrators, nurse, librarian, psychologist, custodian and other staff members.

The aide program prepares the prospective teacher for ninety full days of student internship in a public school.

Public school and university personnel, as well as student teachers, approve of this program for the following reasons:

1. Schools are consulted in general design and modification of the teacher preparation program and exert major influences.
2. School personnel share responsibility in the evaluation of prospective teacher candidates.
3. Permanent teaching positions are often filled with applicants prepared in the system while they were aides or student teachers.
4. The elimination of a variety of less profitable courses in education is economical.
5. Interns feel the variety of experiences provides opportunities to explore personally many facets of public school education

before deciding vocationally on a specific teaching assignment.

6. Prolonged contact with schools makes the transition from teacher candidate to teacher relatively easy.
7. Method courses, which are tedious for inexperienced learners, are replaced by studying methods while working in classrooms.

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM - UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE

A cooperative program in urban teacher education reported on by Monroe and Talmage[1] was developed at the newly created College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. The uniqueness of this program stems from a tripartite consortium of community, university and public school representatives.

In response to Davies' call for an open system,[2]

---

1. George E. Monroe and Harriet Talmage, "Cooperative Program in Urban Education," Journal of Teacher Education, XXI (Winter, 1970), 469-477.

2. Don Davies, "We Have Met the Enemy," Paper read at the Tri-University Project in Elementary Education Conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, September, 1968.

the Cooperative Program in Urban Education Model is predicated on an equal partnership of diverse interested parties that not only tolerates differences among its partners but is also capable of capitalizing on them. This consortium cooperatively develops the teacher education program. The interface of this cooperative planningis the advisory committee and the learning center.

The advisory committee (community-school-university) formulates policy and encourages program development in keeping with previously stated assumptions. The learning center is a selected school; it is both a physical setting and a group phenomenon. Teacher candidates spend considerable time in all these areas, center, community and the university. Members of the advisory committee, working committee and the learning center evaluate the on-going program and suggest alternative procedures.

A very interesting assumption of this program is that a self-renewing mechanism must be devised to assure a dynamic program over time; too often, following the initial Hawthorne effect of innovations, the maintenance of an intact program becomes the major goal. Therefore, the CPUTE model must provide for effective opportunities for all members to function is a number of roles.

TEN MODEL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A far-reaching and innovative attempt to conceive a total approach to teacher education at the elementary school level is the Model Teacher Education Project of the U.S.O.E. Although the ten accepted programs are diverse in nature, they all stress the importance of behavioral objectives and systems analysis. All of the models have questioned the relationship between the pre-teaching experience and the subsequent classroom performance. Although they differ as to the extent of involvement necessary between local schools and universities, none of them have found it advisable to assign the task of teacher training to either the university or the local school exclusively.

In all the ten models, definite efforts have been made to promote cooperative communication among the groups involved in the preparation of teachers. Syracuse has provided for local district and other outside group involvement in the planning and operation of their model through the establishment of a "protocooperative" group. Florida State's "portal school" concept calls for the establishment of an innovative school in each cooperating district. The faculty of each school

is to participate in both the design and operation of the student teacher program. School districts, state departments of education, industry representatives, and professional and community groups participated in the planning of the Northwest Laboratory and Toledo models through a consortium. Community interaction is also a feature of the Michigan State Clinic School Network.[1]

The universities that were awarded grants to develop these systematic comprehensive teacher preparation programs incorporated such concepts as the following in their models.

1. Systematic approaches to teacher education
2. The language of "models"
3. Performance-based criteria
4. Personalized teacher education programs
5. Field centered experience
6. Clinical internship
7. Protocol material
8. Differentiated staffing patterns
9. Training complexes

---

1. Judith Klatt and Walt Le Baron, A Short Summary of Ten Model Teacher Education Programs, (Systems Development Corporation research report for the National Center for Educational Research and Development, November, 1969.)

Several of the exemplary programs cited in this search are incorporating some of the concepts listed above. It can be noted, however, that attempting to develop a single teacher education program which incorporates most of the above concepts is a herculean task.

Task Force '72, formed recently by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, will study the broad problems of educational reform. The task appears to be one of conceptualizing the major elements of several different models and providing several alternatives to any one model.

CONCLUSION

The decade of the 60's can be characterized as a period which saw a move towards the development of a number of different teacher preparation programs, all attempting to devise ways of producing better trained teachers to enter the profession.

In general, these programs stressed the following:

1. Greater cooperation between public schools and universities.
2. A more practical approach to education

courses, with some programs advocating a clinical setting in public school classrooms rather than a university-based setting for the impartation of course content.

3. Increased periods of internship, generally extending for one year or two years.
4. Qualitative changes in the internship process.

Whether or not the decade of the 70's will become a period of realization for the dreams of improved education through teacher training remains to be seen. Much will depend on the quality of the models devised and the degree of cooperation inherent in their design and implementation. It is becoming clear that teacher education can no longer be the exclusive province of one group, but must become the responsibility of all those concerned with the improvement of education.

The models reviewed in this chapter have reflected the belief that new modes of teacher education must be defined and that new ways of establishing cooperative ventures in pre-service education must be explored and validated through implementation.

CHAPTER IV

LOCAL SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

As far back as 1957, Corey pointed out that it would be impractical to expect most teachers to make continuing, independent attempts to improve themselves professionally.[1] Although individual teacher efforts at self-improvement are desirable, too often they do not occur. It must also be noted that such individual efforts even if they do occur, may relate only obliquely to the aims and objectives of the school program. It seems clear that for these reasons, if for no other, carefully planned creative in-service programs for teachers are needed. Unfortunately, such programs are not the usual case.

Toffler's Future Shock[2] and Reich's The Greening of America[3] represent just two of the more popular works which

---

[1] Stephen Corey, "Introduction," In-Service Education, 56th Yearbook, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 1.

[2] Alvin Toffler, Future Shock, (New York: Random House, 1967).

[3] Charles A. Reich, The Greening of America, (New York: Random House, 1967).

are affecting our societies and institutions. Anyone who has read these books or similar ones can easily relate these theses to his personal experience. Rapid and massive changes are producing new stresses. It is imperative that we prepare for these changes.

The educational institution, as all of society's institutions, has experienced great change and innovation in the past decade, perhaps more in this period of ten years than in all the preceding fifty. The relatively recent development and implementation of such concepts as flexibile scheduling, differentiated staffing, non-graded schools, and educational systems approaches are just a few of the more obvious examples of this innovative explosion.

As each of these innovations appeared on the educational scene, many schools looked to the traditional means for disseminating them to practicing teachers - summer or after-school workshops. Even progressive school systems soon found, however, that as soon as teachers became acquainted with the basic elements of a new concept, technique or method, one or several additional or significant innovations emerged. The inevitable conclusion is that the traditional models of in-service education are inadequate for the vital task of creating long-range continuous programs for teachers' in-service.

After surveying the available literature published during the past decade on the in-service education of teachers, we have discovered the following recurring weaknesses among existing in-service programs:

1. They have restricted their focus to the remediation of teacher weaknesses, rather than capitalizing on current teacher strengths.
2. Their objectives have been irrelevant to the priority needs of teachers, students, and the community as each of these groups has perceived their needs.
3. No one has been held accountable for the success of in-service programs.
4. In-service instructors have had limited recent clinical exposure.
5. Those who have initiated in-service programs have failed to cooperate with local universities and colleges in jointly planning the articulation of pre-service with in-service instruction.
6. In-service programs have not taken full advantage of modern communication media, thereby failing to reach a significant number of teachers.
7. In-service programs have failed to offer adequate incentives to the tenured teacher.

A LIMITED FOCUS ON THE REMEDIATION OF TEACHER DEFICIENCIES

Waynant observes that a significant cause of teacher criticism and lack of response to traditional in-service programs [illegible] placed on teachers' deficiencies.[1] According to Waynant, too often the administrator, supervisor, or consultant have looked for what is wrong rather than what is right with teachers in their classroom performance.

Teachers' interests, wishes, and teaching strengths have been given low or no priority in the design of in-service programs. Because their needs and talents have not been acknowledged, the traditional in-service program represents to them an unacceptable threat to their security and professional status. The usual procedure has been for an administrator or supervisor to evaluate teacher weaknesses as part of an annual evaluation process. Too often, Brighton notes, such evaluation processes have been geared to the administrator's objectives:

> The teacher's tenure, promotion, dismissal, assignment, and permanent record are involved. Evaluations made for purely administrative or organizational reasons hold some potentially ominous and threatening implications for the teacher.[2]

---

[1] Louise F. Waynant, "Teachers' Strengths: Basis for Successful In-Service Experiences", Educational Leadership, XXVIII, (April, 1971), pp. 710-12.

[2] Staynor Brighton, Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation, (Successful School Management Series; New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.) pp. 12-13.

Little wonder that in-service programs founded on such a threatening base have met with little teacher enthusiasm. Seldom have administrators aimed at "helping the teacher to succeed, to improve his performance, and to advance his profession."[1] Seldom have they involved teachers in any kind of systematic way in planning programs to assess their respective strengths and weaknesses in a non-threatening atmosphere.

Harris lends further support to the notion that teachers generally have found in-service programs threatening, confusing, or irrelevant.[2] Agreeing with him, Conlin adds that such teachers may feel their skills are inadequate.[3] Because of their self-doubt, they may fear to attempt innovative teaching methods. If in-service programs present new techniques that conflict with their present practices, teachers may become confused. According to Harris, teachers become uneasy about what they are doing, yet are uncertain about what to do differently.

---

[1] Brighton, op. cit., p. 12.

[2] B.M. Harris, "In-Service Growth: The Essential Requirement," Educational Leadership, XXIV, (December, 1966), pp. 257-60.

[3] M.R. Conlin, "Supervising Teachers of the Disadvantaged," Educational Leadership, XXIV, (February, 1967), pp. 393-98.

OBJECTIVES OF IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN IRRELEVANT TO THE PRIORITY NEEDS OF TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND THE COMMUNITY

Given the nature of the evaluation process, administrators and/or supervisors frequently fail to note those areas of performance that the teacher himself feels need strengthening. When supervisors evaluate, they generally employ checklists with vague categories for describing the teaching behavior they observe. The very existence of such checklists presumes that a set of valid, "best" teaching behaviors exists, and more astonishingly, that the quality of teaching can be adequately assessed in one or two short visits to the classroom. The presumptions, of course, are innacurate, yet the practice with all its attendant threat persists.

If the administrator should uncover valid weaknesses in a teacher's performance, the task of conveying the need for improvement to the teacher remains. If the teacher does not perceive this need, he will not act to change his teaching behavior. A checklist does not seem to provide sufficient evidence to prompt him to change. Because of the threat inherent in such an evaluative procedure, the teacher's defense mechanisms may significantly alter his perceptions. Even given the attendant weaknesses of checklist evaluation, the situation would not be all that terrible if the evaluators then translated the discovered "needs" into objectives for in-service programs. Sadly,

even this has not been the case.

Although we in education generally have acknowledged the importance of individualizing instruction for children, we still tend to teach groups of teachers as if they all had the same needs. Many authors, Taylor among them, stress the importance of recognizing the need for greater individualization of instruction for teachers.[1] Teachers enter the teaching profession at different levels of development, and these differences persist throughout the different levels of the profession. It is desirable, if not imperative, therefore, that each teacher's program of continuing in-service education be suited to his personal needs.

It is unfortunate but true that educators in the public schools are not customarily treated as individuals. Their pre-service training consists mainly of a sequence of education courses with little variation in content and approach from one student to the next. But with the encouragement and direction of university faculty members and local school personnel, they could learn to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Through new educational designs, they could gain and maintain a clear understanding of those areas in which growth is necessary.

---

[1] B.L. Taylor, Peggy A Doyle, and Jeffrey A. Link, "A More Humane Teacher Education," Educational Leadership, (April, 1971), pp. 698-701.

Teachers with bachelor's degrees were once considered adequately and permanently prepared to enter the profession and progress in it. It seems incredible that not very long ago many teachers were employed without having attained even this level of formal education.

Today teachers share with other professionals the urgent need for in-service improvement. They are confronted with a host of new developments. Among them are the new mathematics, the new science, new media, new patterns of flexible staffing, not to mention the whole galaxy of challenges inherent in teaching in central cities.

Chaplin stipulates that during the first years of teaching, certain basic conditions in the school must be adapted more closely to the needs of training.[1] The local school must accept more direct responsibility for the training of teachers.

Present arrangements for the continuing education of teachers and specialists, according to Chaplin, are wholly inadequate.[2] They must be radically redesigned to make them more effective. Probably no aspect of contemporary practice is less satisfactory than the education of

---

[1] J.T. Chaplin, "Practice in Teaching," Harvard Educational Review, XXXIII, (Winter, 1963), pp. 40-44.

[2] Ibid.

teachers and specialists after they have joined the full-time staff of a school system. Much of the training is sporadic and lacks relevance to the present or future needs of the individual on the job. It is usually provided by university staff and is given in the traditional classroom manner, even though the teachers might derive more benefit from a "clinical" approach similar to that in programs for doctors and nurses in teaching hospitals. In many cases, the school system does not participate in the training of its personnel, since the salary structures often provide for an increase in pay and rank only after an individual has completed a course sequence at a university.

If the university is to give increased attention to the development of programs of advanced study for novice and special teachers, some changes in the usual procedures will have to be made. It is often difficult if not impossible for teachers to find university instruction appropriate to their real needs. It is also true that only a minority can attend a college or university full-time during the regular academic year. Then again, some types of graduate work might be better taught on the job by specially trained, skilled members of the school systems than by a university staff in a typical classroom setting. It seems clear that local school cooperation is necessary if constructive change in the traditional procedures is to

be made.

Courses and programs in education offered by colleges nd universities tend to be of two kinds: those of ntroductory nature offered to pre-service teachers, and hose leading to specialization in one of the fields of education such as guidance, administration, or research in educational psychology. The latter type presumes that the teacher desires to prepare for advancement out of the classroom. The novice teacher is thus induced to undertake premature specialization away from teaching, because these are primarily the only courses available.

As we further investigated the literature, we turned to programs designed to train the supervisors necessary if the school is to accept responsibility for the training of teachers. In this area we found that work is almost confined to courses in education. Further study in the content areas has been neglected. The aim seems to be to develop general supervisors who will leave the classroom themselves, rather than special subject supervisors well versed in a specific discipline and capable of making contributions to curriculum and to the training of novice teachers while remaining in the classroom themselves.

Robinson, Chaplin, and Keppel argue for an individual diagnosis of the practice needs of the novice and the arrangement of practice appropriate to his particular

stage of development.[1] To accomplish this, the authors imply that those in charge of the in-service programs must have considerable control over the practice arrangement. Some novice teachers are ready to accept responsibility; in fact, they demand it. Others need a gradual induction into teaching with increases in responsibility as warranted by performance.

An additional consideration relative to in-service programs concerns the community. The local community certainly has a valid right to be vitally interested in the education of its children. Yet, the community's influence in the development of in-service programs designed to increase the skills of those who teach their children has been noticeably slight. As a result, the teachers, and hence the educational program, have not always been responsive to the needs and desires of the community they serve. Surely there is cause for reform in this regard. The next weakness in in-service programs pertains to this point.

A LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY

Agnes Ridley has noted that as American society and its culture have grown more complicated, the employing

---

[1] Francis Keppel, Judson T. Chaplin, and Wade Robinson, "Recent Developments at the Harvard Graduate School of Education," The High School Journal, 43:5, (February, 1960), pp. 242-61.

public has come to expect more extensive and discriminating service from teachers.[1] Assuming that the quality of a teacher's service is determined not only by what he does before he enters the profession, but also by what he accomplishes after entry, the public has a right to demand better structured in-service as well as pre-service programs. The public once equated number of years taught, degrees attained, and semester hours of earned credit with the professional quality of teachers. In recent years however, the whole idea that quantity of preparation yields quality of service has come under close public scrutiny. Salary schedules have generally been based upon the quantity assumption less for its validity and more for the convenience of administrators, as Ridley has so astutely observed.

Never before, Darland has warned, has so much been expected of teachers in this country. From new conditions new demands have sprung, greatly altering what is expected of education. The American teacher has become a likely candidate for scapegoat of the 1970's.[2] Evidence can be noted in the current drive to hold teachers accountable for quality education in our schools. Although this demand for accountability appears difficult to fault, it has

---

[1] Agnes F. Ridley, "In-Service Education and the Affective Domain," American Vocational Journal, (January, 1971), pp. 46-68.

[2] D.D. Darland, "The Profession's Quest for Responsibility and Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, (September, 1970), pp. 41-44.

reached the point where outside agencies are offering to succeed if our schools cannot produce the desired educational improvement. Perhaps the problem lies in the fact that in-service programs have not kept pace with the educational innovations. Educational improvement through in-service training cannot be effected however, unless definite guidelines are established for the assessment and evaluation of appropriate techniques and content for in-service education. The need for accountability must extend to in-service programs if it is to be applicable to education in general.

LIMITED CLINICAL EXPOSURE OF IN-SERVICE INSTRUCTORS

Traditionally, in-service programs have utilized supervisors who have not been recently involved in public school teaching. As a result, they tend to lack understanding of the many problems facing the practicing teacher. According to Cole, professors of education are too often charged, and rightly so, with not practicing what they preach.[1] It is certainly true that many who teach in-service courses lack recent, relevant classroom teaching experience -- experience which could validate or alter the methods and techniques they are espousing.

---

[1] James C. Cole, "Improving Teacher Education: A Proposal for Re-Experience," Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966), pp. 136-38.

According to Denemark, we are still not taking advantage of the talents of various teachers that are on the staff.[1] The use of master teachers or outstanding career teachers as consultants in teaching in-service courses is not a general practice. Teacher-educators working cooperatively with the area colleges and universities to provide in-service training is still a largely untried practice. Able classroom teachers are often promoted out of the classroom rather than being induced to stay where their talents could be more beneficially utilized to upgrade the skills of their peers.

LACK OF COOPERATIVE PLANNING TO RELATE PRE-SERVICE TO IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Howlis Moore observes that:

> One of the most dramatic changes which could be made in the career development of teachers would be for school systems and colleges and universities to accept a joint responsibility for the development of each teacher to professional status.[2]

He feels that the two most common approaches, isolated college courses and unrelated, locally initiated workshops, will not suffice to achieve this objective.

---

[1] George W. Denemark, "St. Louis," Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966), pp. 84-97.

[2] Howlis Moore, "Raleigh," Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966), p. 25.

Because both traditional approaches fail to diagnose and prescribe to remediate deficiencies, they retard rather than enhance professioanl growth. Cooperative planning could provide the impetus for beneficial individualization of teacher education.

Another reason for advocating cooperative planning of in-service programs relates to the teacher dropout problem. It could be that this problem stems from the gulf between pre-service and in-service education of teachers. All toooften, there is little articulation between the college and the school system with a resultant lack of continuity between pre- and in-service teacher education programs. This lack of continuity could create confusion in teachers and lead ultimately to disillusionment with education as a profession.

It seems clear that a systematic extension and enrichment of pre-service programs is desirable. The means for accomplishing this best is probably cooperative planning by schools and universities in order to ensure that whatever benefits exist in the pre-service phase are not lost in the in-service phase of teacher education.

FAILURE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF MODERN COMMUNICATION MEDIA

There have been many technical innovations which could be utilized for in-service education of teachers.

Allen and Ryan have reported on the beneficial uses of technological hardware in the upgrading of teacher skills.[1] They stress the benefits to be gained from systematic use of video tape recordings of class sessions, micro-teaching, and time-lapse photography.

Attea, in reporting on the Wilmette Public Schools' use of video tape recorders to improve instruction noted many benefits, especially for beginning teachers.[2] The benefits accruing to teachers were reflected in an improved educational setting for the students involved.

Unfortunately, many in-service efforts neglect to take advantage of media. Instead, they concentrate on traditional lecture type presentations, failing thereby, to tap a very potent tool for teacher improvement.

IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS HAVE FAILED TO OFFER ADEQUATE INCENTIVES TO THE TENURED TEACHER

Differentiated staffing could be a vehicle for the restructuring of the school organization in order to permit

---

[1]Dwight W. Allen and Kevin A. Ryan, "A New Face for Supervision," Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966), pp. 121-26.

[2]William J. Attea, "VTR: In-Service Tool for Improving Instruction," Educational Leadership, (November, 1970), pp. 147-50.

teachers to make maximum use of their talents.[1]

Too often, the highly competent teacher must leave the classroom if he wishes to advance himself. Many experienced and excellent teachers might be induced to stay in the profession of teaching if they were provided with opportunities for greater professional satisfaction and recognition.[2] Through innovative and creative in-service programs tied to flexibly organized staffing models, skilled teachers could find adequate incentive not only to take in-service courses, but to remain in the classroom as well. The ensuing benefits of their increased expertise could have a dramatic effect on education.

CONCLUSION

In essence, preparing teachers for innovation is a joint responsibility. With the pressure and responsibilities being placed on education, teacher education institutions and public schools have much to gain from

---

[1] Richard W. Saxe, "New Ways to Differentiate Assignments Within a School," Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966).

[2] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, A Position Statement on the Concept of Differentiated Staffing, May 11, 1969, 6-8.

collaborative efforts. It is implied in this chapter that closer working relationships between schools and colleges in planning and conducting not only pre-service but also in-service teacher education programs must be established. It has been pointed out by some writers that such relationships have been, for the most part, ceremonial. It has been stressed in this chapter that rather than unilateral decisions by administrators as to what teachers need, the teachers themselves ought to be involved in the decision making process. New training programs for school administrators, programs geared to the changing needs of the teachers, the schools, and the community must be developed. To accomplish these objectives, Davies states that "without truly cooperative work on the part of both schools and colleges, the possibilities for remaking the world of the career teacher by the use of conducive in-service programs are slim."[1]

---

[1]Don Davies, "An Era of Opportunity," Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966), pp. 199-204.

CHAPTER V

EMERGING TRENDS OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION IN THE 1970'S

In Chapter IV, the importance of in-service education was stressed. The weaknesses in traditional programs were outlined. This chapter will attempt to describe specific projects in in-service education which attempt to overcome these weaknesses. Emerging trends and suggestions for remediation of these weaknesses will also be discussed.

BUILDING ON TEACHER STRENGTHS

Waynant emphasizes that relevant and effective in-service programs can be established if they are built around teacher strengths and concerns.[1] Waetjen lends support to this assumption when he states, "If a person is accepted and valued and esteemed, he becomes an inquiring person and he actualizes himself."[2] DeCarlo and Cleland report the results of a study which illustrates that teachers respond positively to in-service programs

---

[1] Waynant, loc. cit., p. 710.

[2] Walter B. Waetjen, "Facts About Learning," Readings in Curriculum, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965).

geared to what they want and need.[1]

Waynant has offered some useful guidelines for planning in-service work based on teacher strength and providing for maximum involvement.

1. Identify teacher strengths, interests, and concerns through observation and discussion.
2. Utilize teacher strengths, interests, and [illegible] in planning and conducting the in-service program.
3. Provide a feedback system whereby teachers can inform consultants if information is useful, relevant, and clear enough for implementation.
4. Guarantee consulting results in performance terms.[2]

MAXIMIZING TEACHER INVOLVEMENT

Harris stresses that planning for in-service programs should be a cooperative venture.[3] Those who will

---

[1] Mary DeCarlo and Donald L. Cleland, "A Reading in In-Service Education Programs for Teachers," The Reading Teacher, XXII, (November, 1968), pp. 163-69.

[2] Waynant, loc. cit.

[3] Ben M. Harris, "In-Service Growth," Educational Leadership, (December, 1966), pp. 257-60.

be affected by the in-service program, the teachers, should be systematically involved in the planning at all stages.

PROJECT BONUS - CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND

An in-service program which attempts to maximize teacher involvement and capitalize on teacher strengths is Project Bonus.[1]

Project Bonus involved two phases. Phase I consisted of a week of in-service training in reading for teachers, and Phase II consisted of six weeks of pupil instruction. An important feature of the project was the consultant assistance which all the teachers involved in the project commented favorably on at the concluding workshop. They implemented the techniques they learned in the workshop with their pupils and observed positive changes in both attitude and behavior in a majority of the students. Principals indicated that not only were Project Bonus teachers using their new skills in the fall, but were sharing their knowledge with their colleagues.

It appears that the success of Project Bonus was due in large measure to the high amount of teacher

---

[1] Waynant, loc. cit.

involvement in its planning and implementation. Another success factor was the emphasizing of teacher strengths and interests rather than weaknesses and deficiencies.

CALIFORNIA TEACHER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

In an attempt to correct another major weakness, (the irrelevance of programs to the needs of teachers) the California Teacher Development Project for Systems of Individualized Instruction, a Title III, E.S.E.A. Proposal, was funded in 1968.[1] Teacher and student representatives of all grade levels, except kindergarten, from five California public school districts and the parochial schools of the Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco participated in this project. The objective of the project was to provide in-service training for teachers and administrators who were moving towards individualized instruction and away from static group instruction. The program was designed as an individualized workshop where each participant selected five or six components on which to concentrate for the five day period. The resource material for the components was gathered from many sources, but significantly, each

---

[1] Dennis Carmichael and Warren Kallenbach, "The California Teacher Development Project: An Individualized Approach to In-Service Education," Journal of Secondary Education, XLVI, (January, 1971), pp. 16-20.

component, with only one or two exceptions, was prepared by a teacher experienced in that area of individualized instruction.

JACKSON COUNTY, COLORADO MICRO-TEACHING PROGRAM

Another emerging trend in in-service programs pertains to micro-teaching. First introduced in 1963 at Stanford by Dwight Allen, micro-teaching has become an established teacher training procedure in many colleges, universities, and school districts. Jackson County, Colorado's summer program was designed around the use of micro-teaching.[1] The program was developed to upgrade the entire instructional program in the school district by providing in-service training opportunities in team teaching and flexible scheduling. Each teaching team used the micro-teaching technique to perfect their skills before teaching a whole class. The video tapes of the micro-lessons were then critiqued by the team. During the summer more than one hundred teachers and several hundred children participated in the micro-teaching experience. Meier reports that the school system

---

[1] John H. Meier, "Rationale for and Application of Micro Training to Improve Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education, (Summer, 1968), p. 145-57.

derived many benefits from this type of in-service training program. Many of the innovations validated during the summer were subsequently introduced into the regular school year's program.

CHILD STUDY INSTITUTE

Meier also reports on another in-service program which was developed under the auspices of the National Defense Education Act, Title XI, by the Child Study Institute at Colorado State College.[1] One hundred teachers in early childhood programs throughout the country received training in management of new programs for pre-school and beginning school children. To conduct this program, filmed learning episodes and video tape recordings of actual teaching situations were utilized. Supervision was provided by personnel located at the Child Study Institute in Greeney. After watching the filmed learning episodes and reading accompanying written material, each teacher attempted to achieve the objectives of the episode through a micro-teaching process. After several practice sessions, the teacher would make a video tape of his efforts and mail it to the Child Study

---

[1] John Meier, Remote Training of Early Childhood Educators, Title XI, Institute of the National Defense Education Act, (Greeney, Colorado: Colorado State College, July, 1968).

Institute where a team critique and evaluation were made. These were then mailed to the teacher. After the teacher was satisfied that he had accomplished the objectives of the episode, he would receive a new unit. Upon completion of the course, the participating teacher received university course credit from Colorado State College.

The effectiveness of the training program was determined by assessing the teachers' attitudes and opinions about the method of training, and by observing changes in their cognitive and affective behavior as observed on the tapes. The trainees showed growth in both the cognitive and attitudinal areas.

T.T.T. PROJECT

A project designed to strengthen the clinical approach to teacher training is the government sponsored T.T.T. concept.[1] Single T's are thought of as pre-service students (interns or novice teachers in their first year of teaching). Double T's are experienced teachers who act as cooperating teachers to train single T's or as teacher retrainers who implement innovations within the school or district. Triple T's are trainers of trainers of teachers.

---

[1] TTT Final Report, (San Francisco, California: San Francisco State College, San Francisco Unified School District, September 1, 1969 to August 31, 1970).

At the Washington University Triple T Project, an attempt was made to establish a new professional role, the "clinical associate," an experienced public school teacher who assumes university responsibility for teacher preparation. The clinical associate coordinates pre-service and in-service teacher training programs within a public school designated as a triple T teaching center.

1969-70 a joint teacher education program of San Francisco State College and the San Francisco Unified School District assigned teaching-learning roles according to a career ladder outlined below.[1]

1. TTT -- Ten college instructors and demonstration supervisors trained mutually for supervision and instruction focused on general strategy and the TABA Curriculum Project.
2. TT -- Fifteen district supervising classroom teachers who are trainers of the teacher candidates and are trained by the TTT instructors.
3. T -- Twenty-four first year teacher graduates of the 1968-69 program.
4. TC -- Thirty-four teacher candidates trained by TTT staff and supervising classroom teachers.

In this program, virtually all the training took place in the schools. The program also involved liberal arts faculty from the university, community leaders, and parents.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 50.

B-2 -- TEACHER TRAINING MODULES

An in-service project funded under the Education Professions Development Act (Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1968) has been initiated in the state of Florida which emphasizes the concept of an individualized approach to in-service education.

The major objective of this program was to develop individualized teacher training material. Approximately fifty training modules had been completed and field tested by the start of the 1971-72 school year. The materials presently developed fall into seven general headings with approximately eight modules under each heading. The general headings are listed below:

1. Defining the Role of the Teacher Aide
2. Using Behavioral Objectives
3. Establishing Appropriate Frames of Reference
4. Set Induction
5. Question Upgrading Improvement Package
6. Evaluating Learning and Instruction
7. Methods of Introducing and Summarizing a Unit

A general topic such as "Using Behavioral Objectives" is divided into eight individual modules. A teacher or group of teachers can select this topic and work through the modules either individually or in groups. A resource person is provided for the purpose of monitoring and

assisting the teacher through the module or cluster of modules.

Each module is designed so that the teacher takes a preassessment test and after following the procedures outlined, then takes the post-assessment test. All materials needed to complete the suggested activities are either included or described in each module.

The advantages of the program are listed below:

1. Teachers can select topics they feel would improve their teaching skills.
2. Teachers can progress at their own rate through each module or choose to work in pairs or groups.
3. Each module is "self-contained" with the objectives, rationale, materials, procedures, and evaluation very specifically indicated.

DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

A promising emerging trend in in-service is the development of differentiated staffing patterns in many school systems. In the Florida School Staffing Study particular emphasis is placed on the role of the teacher in training other teachers and working with interns. In one of the project schools in Miami, Florida, the role of

the master teacher has been established. This teacher has responsibility for training as well as assigned classroom responsibilities. By assisting the growth of others, and by being required to maintain and improve his own skills, the master teacher becomes a key figure in the improvement of educational practices. Additional prestige and compensation serve to make the role of master teacher an attractive one, thereby providing for the retention of highly skilled people in the classroom.

The University of Massachusetts is participating in the Miami program by supplying interns for the project. Byxbee describes the procedure for intern evaluation and improvement.[1] The teacher and intern would meet regularly to work on various methods and techniques for more effective teaching. They would isolate a particular area that they feel needs improvement. Then during a pre-conference, they would cooperatively develop a contract. The intern would, as specifically as possible, delineate the ultimate goals of the lesson. The supervisor would then describe the ways in which he will evaluate the success of the lesson. As soon as each person feels that he knows what he is going to do and how he will approach the task, the intern goes through a micro-teaching session to work on the skill. The two then have a post conference addressing themselves

---

[1] William Byxbee, Intern Advisor, University of Massachusetts. Personal interview, (August 24, 1971).

to the specific goals and evaluative tools already agreed upon.

LOCAL AND UNIVERSITY COOPERATION

The positive results of cooperative planning have been stressed but, unfortunately, in many cases, in-service programs have been mandated by administrators.[1] A program which illustrates the benefits to be gained from cooperative planning for a specific purpose is the Rockdale County, Georgia Project.

ROCKDALE COUNTY, GEORGIA PROJECT

The Rockdale County Board of Education in Georgia operated an in-service program focusing on desegregation in 1969.[2] The purpose of the program was to make the desegregation process smoother for the school system and the community through the teaching and administrative staff. A Coordinating Committee composed of teachers, administrators and lay members from the community was established. This committee participated in sensitivity training and

---

[1]Carl W. Hassel, "A Study of Certain Factors to In-Service Education in Selected School Districts in New York State,: Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1960.

[2]H. S. Shearouse, In-Service Education to Solve Problems Incident to the Elimination of the Dual School System, (Conyers, Georgia: Rockdale County Public Schools), November, 1969.

learned how to lead small group discussions on topics such as the disadvantaged child, student and teacher experience in desegregated schools, sensitivity, and black and white confrontations.

The [illegible] from segregated schools to desegregated schools was smooth. Results from a semantic differential questionnaire administered to teachers indicated [illegible] change in attitude towards the in-service program and its objectives. Apparently the strong leadership provided in the seminars by the members of the Coordinating Committee was instrumental to the success of the program.

RIVER ROUGE, MICHIGAN PROJECT

A correlated set of summer workshops was conducted in the summer of 1970 for elementary teachers in the River Rouge, Michigan School District.[1] The objective was to acquaint them with certain systematic techniques for management of classroom behavior and instructional materials, and to provide practice in their use. The program provided participants with first-hand knowledge, practice, and experience. In the contigency management

[1] William Melching, Introducing Innovations in Instruction: Teacher Workshops in Classroom Management, (Alexandria, Virginia: Resources Research Organization), November, 1970.

workshop, for example, classroom practice was designed so that pupils and teachers could alternate as teachers and observers. Administrative and supervisory personnel were involved in additional workshops so that they would be equipped to aid teachers as they implemented the new techniques. The program participants considered the workshops a success.

PHILADELPHIA TEACHER CENTER

A booklet entitled "Model Programs: Childhood Education" is one of a series of thirty-four recently published for the White House Conference on Children, December, 1970.[1] It describes the Philadelphia Teacher Center, a place where teachers can develop materials for their classrooms and exchange ideas. The center, a unique concept in staff development, provides the teachers with materials and tools and conducts workshops. Examples of things that can be made with the materials provided and a library of professional books and manuals are on display.

---

[1] Model Programs: Childhood Education, (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Teacher Center - Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research), 1970.

CONCLUSION

It is apparent that greater cooperation of school districts and universities in programs of teacher education can benefit both institutions. Through the establishment of cooperatively developed career ladders, induction into the profession could become a more natural and gradual process. Teachers would move back and forth from college campus to school districts, theory and practice might be more profitably combined, and career education and re-education could be planned for at the outset. Through cooperative planning, the interests and needs of teachers, as well as those of universities, the local school, and the community could be more adequately met.

Other considerations relative to improved in-service education have been implied throughout Chapters IV and V. Teachers in the seventies will need to be involved in the creation, organization and implementation of in-service programs. Such programs will require the sophistication that the use of systematic observation techniques can provide. Technological hardware will offer new opportunities for the improvement of teaching skills and should, therefore, be employed in in-service education.

Individual teacher needs must be met through new designs and teachers should have the option of participating

in such designs. New roles will have to be defined with in-service instructors having the unique experience of participating in a dual educational environment, familiar with the goals and aims of the university, but concerned and knowledgeable about the public school as well.

A major concern of new in-service programs should be the development of incentives for remaining in the teaching profession and for the upgrading of teaching skills. Programs which capitalize on teacher strengths and which stress teacher self-renewal are vital in this regard. The development of differentiated staffing models was suggested as a vehicle for promoting incentive.

CHAPTER VI

REORGANIZATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

One does not have to go to the popular press or to perennial critics of education to find support for massive changes in teacher education. Educators such as B. O. Smith, Arthur Combs, Roy Edelfelt, and Theodore Sizer; and professional organizations such as the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards are all calling for sweeping changes.

At present, a major weakness in teacher preparation programs is the lack of public school involvement. Although there are fragmented cooperative university-public school preparation programs in existence, these programs have not changed the overall structure of either the public school or the university in terms of training teachers. As Combs has stated, "What is needed is more than a tinkering job."[1]

Public school input has been and remains minimal in teacher preparation programs. Such issues as curriculum, internship and entry rites remain the exclusive responsibility of the university and the

---

1. Combs, loc. cit.

State Department. However, the major criticisms of teacher preparation could be remediated in the public schools through programs that involve working with students in real situations.

The theory-practice gap has been a critical issue at least since Dewey's first writings. Traditional teacher preparation programs have assumed that theory could be sufficiently explored in the university setting. This has proved to be a false assumption; new directions are clearly needed, and new ways of applying theories to practice in classroom situations must be explored. A professor can expound at great length about Piaget's concrete-operational stage. It is only when an intern actually experiences the stages of development through working with children, however, that the full impact of Piagetian theory becomes apparent.

As can be inferred from the above paragraph, professors and teachers working apart cannot conjoin theory and practice. Professors spend a large proportion of their time lecturing, and the classroom teacher lacks the pedagogical expertise to amalgamate theory with practice.

What is needed are cooperative programs wherein university, and public school representatives jointly

share the responsibility for developing and implementing models which abridge the theory practice gap. State Departments of Education could aid in this realignment of functions by allocating funds for teacher preparation programs to cooperatively formed consortiums rather than to individual universities. No longer can the university retain the exclusive right to control pre-service training. However, simply allowing the public school system more authority in pre-service training without revising the present organization of schools will do little more than perpetuate past practices, albeit through different channels.

Many educators have proposed revisions of the traditional model. Representative suggestions are as follows:

1. Methods courses are more effective if taught in clinical settings in real life classrooms.
2. Theory and practice can be fused if lectures and seminars are combined with practical application in classroom settings.
3. Pedagogical techniques such as Taba's Teaching Strategy, use of higher order questioning, micro-teaching and systematic observation can only be effected through

direct contact with children.

4. Length of internship must now be viewed as at least a two year program with additional years spent in externship before actual entry into the profession.
5. New and specific procedures for the training of public school cooperating teachers must be devised in order that they might become the most highly trained professors in the teacher preparation program.

The vehicle often proposed to transform the above suggestions into programs is the teacher preparation center which has been established with universities and public schools sharing responsibility for teacher training.

The establishment of such centers would do much to improve teacher preparation and hence education in general. The temptation to hail these centers as the panacea for all the problems facing the schools today must be resisted, however. Drugs, integration, ecology, etc. - these are all problems which impinge upon the school. Yet, other of society's institutions must share the burden of these modern-day complexities. If

other agencies of society assume responsibility for certain aspects of the educational process appropriate to their function, and if they are adequately funded, the improved teacher education programs will not require massive financial support. The greatest proportion of financial support would be the initial piloting of models such as The Model of Professional Educator Training reviewed later in this chapter.

Teacher preparation centers must be established where resources, both financial and human, can be combined in a concerted effort to improve pre-service training. Most of the programs referred to in Chapter 3 were accomplished in teaching centers. However, simply designating centers without substantially improving the competence of the teacher trainers will do little to improve the overall competence of the beginning teacher.

The appointment of the cooperating teacher must be shared by the public school and the university. The role of the traditional college intern supervisor will probably be dissolved. The cooperating teacher works with the intern for a one to two year period; he obviously should be more qualified to judge the competence of the beginning teacher than the college professor who drops

in once every few weeks to view a canned lesson.

The time has come to develop a degree program leading to a doctorate for cooperating teachers. These people should be the brightest, most highly trained professionals in education. They are the ones who must have not only a sound theoretical background but also the ability to translate theories into practice. They must be expert in terms of teaching strategies and able to work comfortably with both student teachers and children in the affective and cognitive domains. They must be aware of the latest supervisory techniques and capable of systematically analyzing teacher-pupil behavior. There seems to be a pressing need for public school and university personnel to cooperatively design proposed programs which would train teachers to the level indicated above.

The following proposed program is an effort to incorporate some of the aforementioned features. It has received state support in Florida and has been reviewed favorably in Washington. Portions of the program are being implemented in the Northeast District of Dade County, Florida and hopefully by the 1972-73 school year all phases of the program will be in operation.

PROSPECTUS FOR MODEL OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR TRAINING[1]

INTRODUCTION

Teaching has become a complex art. The dimensions of teaching responsibilities and opportunities increase with each advance in understanding the nature of children and learning. In an American community in which [illegible] increasingly serves as an important agent of social change, the preparation of teachers assumes ever more complex dimensions. Present programs, which have traditionally provided pre-service study of theoretical components of teaching and rather short, often unrelated, observation, participation, and student teaching, have often left the beginning teacher woefully unprepared for the "real world" of teaching.

At the present time, there are no clear national standards of measurable performance criteria in the classroom situation for use as the basis for teacher certification and entry into the teaching profession. Educators in Florida have become concerned with setting up guidelines for accountability criteria in the granting of teacher certification. A model in which school systems, teacher preparation institutions, and certification agencies cooperatively develop programs based

---

[1]Developed by Thomas H. Peeler and Jerome R. Shapiro, Dade County, Florida, 1971.

on differentiated and clearly defined levels of measurable performance leading to teacher certification is obviously desirable.

In order to implement a successful certification program, it is proposed that on-site teacher training centers stressing competency-based teacher education be established in schools throughout the state. It is proposed also that a consortium be established to initiate such a program. In agreement at this time with the need for the establishment of such a consortium in Florida are Florida Atlantic University, Florida A. and M. University, the University of Massachusetts, the Northeast District of Dade County Public Schools, and the Florida State Department of Education as represented by the Florida School Staffing Study.

Eventually, an innovative certification program as is herein proposed might serve as a prototype for subsequent establishment of teacher certification centers throughout the nation.

IDENTIFICATION OF TERMS AS USED IN THE MODEL OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR TRAINING (MOPET)

The Consortium - The combined efforts of the

aforementioned agencies, all of whom are concerned with teaching, teacher education, and/or teacher certification, with additional representatives from community agencies will serve to promote a more relevant teacher training program. Representatives of the Consortium will serve as the policy making body.

The Teacher Training Center - The Center would be located in a functioning school exemplifying individualized education and employing organizational patterns and instructional strategies conducive to the implementation of individualized instruction. The Teacher Training Center would also, by virtue of its association with the Florida State Department of Education through the Consortium, be designated as a Certification Center.

The Staff - The staff of the Center will be made up of university and school personnel. A Center staff member will be capable of working with both school pupils and college students and will possess competency in developing pupil and teacher learning activities. In addition, staff members will be committed to the concept of individual progress and will demonstrate this commitment through activities adapted to specific models of individualized instruction.

The Participants - Undergraduate teacher candidates who have completed the basic liberal arts requirements at an accredited institution of higher learning will work through a three-year professional studies sequence termed a Career Ladder. Previously certificated teachers on the Staff may work through a Career Ladder towards an advanced degree.

The Career Ladders - The Center will provide for all levels of a differentiated staff. In addition, provision will be made for movement up Career Ladders. However, the desire to move up the Ladders will not be a prerequisite for entrance into the program. Steps on the Career Ladder for prospective teachers are as follows:

1. Junior Intern
2. Senior Intern
3. Teacher Assistant (Baccalaureate Degree)
4. Teacher (Master's Degree and State approved Center certification)

Steps on the Career Ladder for Staff teachers are as follows:

1. Master's Degree

2. Educational Specialist Degree with a major in Student Teacher Training
3. Doctor of Education Degree with a major in Certification Assessment

Assessment of Needs

Teacher preparation programs are needed which provide for:

1. Longer periods of time in school settings in which students of teaching may relate sound educational theory to practice in the profession.
2. More adequate supervision and guidance in initial teaching experience.
3. Closer cooperation among teacher preparation institutions, teacher certification agencies, public schools, and community in planning and implementing professional preparation programs.
4. Professional development for public school and university staff members to up-date their knowledge and repertory of teaching skills, specifically as they relate to the training of student teachers.

General Objectives

MOPET is defined specifically as a program where

prospective teachers are assigned to the Northeast District for longer periods of time than the usual short term student teaching experience. A formal program for the pre-service and in-service training of teachers will be a function of this program and will be accomplished through the Consortium. Student teachers' classroom performance will be evaluated through selected measurable teaching criteria.

Some basic ideas presented in this prospectus are:

1. To develop a consortium from representatives of Florida Atlantic University, the University of Massachusetts, Florida A. and M. University, the Northeast District of Dade County Public Schools, the Florida State Department of Education, and various community agencies.
2. To establish competency-based certification procedures for prospective teachers.
3. To establish performance criteria for student-teacher trainers.
4. To develop through the Consortium specific criteria for the granting of an Educational Specialist degree for student-teacher trainers and an Educational Doctorate degree for certification assessment specialists.
5. To utilize instructional elements designed to

individualize teacher training.

Philosophical Bases of MOPET

The following value commitments and educational goals are basic to the development of MOPET.

1. Continuous progress at all levels of education
2. Individualization and personalization of instruction
3. Uniqueness of teaching and learning style
4. Necessity of providing a variety of alternatives in learning activities and experiences
5. Development of ability to self-evaluate and self-direct one's own learning
6. Facilitation of inquiry--learning how to learn and think
7. Importance of positive self-concept development
8. Need to explore new approaches to the accountability or evaluation process--e.g. identification of performance based criteria or performance indicators and examination of the role of feedback
10. Need to examine the changing roles of teacher and learner at all levels
11. Need for cooperation among the various agencies and institutions involved in the education of children

Commitment to the above leads to several kinds of implications for teacher education:

1. Need to establish Certification Centers which will provide for more cooperation among agencies involved in teacher education and certification
2. Need to explore effective ways of utilizing teacher educator personnel--both university and public school
3. Need to identify knowledge, skills, and attitudes which will be desirable outcomes of designed learning experiences
4. Need to examine ways of analyzing teaching behavior which will help individuals to grow in self-evaluative abilities
5. Need to design, describe, invent and appraise the kinds of learning activities which make up a teacher preparation program and the appropriate placement of the above
6. Need to search for new and better ways to interrelate theory and practice
7. Need to examine a variety of alternative approaches to the field experience component of the program

In preparing teachers to cope with a rapidly changing

world, we can no longer afford to be institution bound at either the university or public school level. Isolated and short term kinds of experiences seem to violate the notions of continuous progress and integration of theory and practice. Teacher educators are beginning to view teacher preparation as more properly involving a continuum of experiences.

Secondly, the accountability question is becoming critical, making it necessary for teacher educators to deal with the problem of identification of performances necessary for beginning teaching effectiveness. The traditional 8-10 or even 16 week student teaching experience has been increasingly viewed as inadequate in this regard. Three-year internships and Certification Centers are among the alternatives being suggested to bridge the gap between pre-service and in-service development.

It is clear that new models for teacher education which have some universal and transferable qualities must be developed since teacher education can no longer be dealt with effectively by one institutional body. It is with this in mind that MOPET is being proposed.

Program Provisions of MOPET

Phase I

1. Representatives from the participating agencies

of the Consortium will be identified.

2. The representatives will cooperatively identify clusters of teacher training competencies.
3. The proposed initial Certification Center has been identified as the Northeast District, Dade County, Florida.
4. Specifications for attainment of baccalaureate, masters, specialist and doctorate degrees will be agreed upon by the Consortium members.
5. Proposed training procedures necessary for achieving the identified competencies will be cooperatively developed through the Consortium.
6. Training experiences will be initiated.
7. The Consortium will monitor progress of MOPET and continually redefine goals and program components on the basis of feedback from varying sources.

Phase II

1. On the basis of cooperatively considered evaluation, appropriate revisions will be implemented.
2. The Consortium will disseminate materials and reports as to the effectiveness of the program.

Phase III

Phase III might well be the establishment of other such centers in various geographic localities, with the

Northeast District serving as the prototype Center.

CONCLUSIONS

MOPET represents an effort to cooperatively develop a viable teacher education program. It is characterized by a number of unique features:

1. University student teachers will engage in a program that emphasizes meaningful classroom experiences as the basis for teacher certification and entry into the teaching profession.
2. An in-service program will be implemented cooperatively through a Consortium of institutions devoted to teaching, teacher education, and teacher certification.
3. The University and the school system will be restructured to permit a shared instructional responsibility in the teacher education program.
4. Staff in both the University and school system will engage in a continual self-renewal program as data from the various feedback systems might indicate.
5. Teachers of exceptional ability will be afforded opportunities for professional advancement

to higher degree status while their services are still being utilized by the public school system.

6. The entry into the profession would now become the responsibility of a Consortium University - Public School - State Department of Education - Community.

7. The training of teachers would take place under an "open system" with input and provisions for self renewal coming from several sub-systems.

   1. Public School
   2. Community
   3. University
   4. State Department of Education

Programs of the nature cited above, perhaps combined with some features from the models cited in Chapter 3 promise to greatly change the overall training program for teachers. It is encouraging to note that practically all the emerging models are stressing cooperative ventures with public schools and universities, with a few of the models including the community.

MOPET and other similar cooperative models previously described could be the base from which improved approaches to in-service training emerge. MOPET already makes provisions for the specialized training of teachers in supervisory techniques. Through the cooperative approach to planning and implementation stressed in these models, in-service education could become more responsive to the needs of those concerned - the teachers, the local administrative body, the community and the state department of education. The university representation in the Consortium or advisory council could be an important factor in the development of more sophisticated techniques of training.

If more effective pre-service training programs are instituted on a large scale, the effect will be cumulative, leading to new and different in-service needs. The focus of in-service training will undoubtedly have to change to incorporate more innovative concepts.

If the benefits derived from new and exciting pre-service teacher education programs are not to be dissipated, then special efforts to extend these benefits to in-service participants must be made.

New techniques and new approaches to teacher education must not be reserved for prospective teachers but must be adapted for career teachers as well.

Throughout this paper, cooperative approaches to teacher education have been advocated. Although such approaches are probably just as desirable for in-service training as for pre-service training, the individual needs of teachers should receive prime consideration. Merely prescribing for teachers without actively involving them in decision making violates the very principles that our more enlightened educators espouse.

The sixties have brought many changes to society and to education. But as has been pointed out in this and previous chapters, teacher education still has a long way to go. It has been said that the seventies are a time for giant steps in education.[1] Surely one of the most pressing needs for giant steps pertains to the reorganization of teacher education. And surely the local effort in this regard will be instrumental in not only the extent but also the quality of this reorganization.

---

1. Joe L. Frost and G. Thomas Roland, "The Seventies: a Time for Giant Steps," The Education Digest, (February, 1970), 1 - 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Dwight W. "A Differentiated Staff: Putting Teacher Talent To Work." The Teacher and His Staff, Occasional Paper No. 1, (December, 1967), pp. 6-8.

Allen, Dwight W. "Microteaching: A New Framework For In-Service Education." The High School Journal, (May, 1969).

Allen, Dwight W. and Ryan, Kevin. "A New Pace for Supervision." Breaking the World of the Career Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966, pp. 121-26.

Andrews L.O. "Initial Preparation of the Career Teacher." Educational Leadership, XXVII, (March, 1970).

Attea, William. "VTR: In-Service Tool for Improving Instruction." Educational Leadership, XXVII, (November, 1970), pp. 147-50.

Aubertine, Horace E. "The Use of Microteaching in Training Supervising Teachers." The High School Journal, (November, 1967), pp. 99-106.

Avila, D.L., Combs, A.W., Olson W., Packer A., Shea, J. Description of the University of Florida Experimental Program in Elementary Education. (Mimeographed).

Barbee, Don. "Differentiated Staffing: Expectations and Pitfalls." TEPS Write in Paper No. 1 on Flexible Staffing Patterns. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, (March, 1969).

Beaubier, Edward W. "Experiences With Differentiated Staffing." Today's Education - NEA Journal, (March, 1969), pp. 56-58.

Bellack, A. Davitz, Joel, and others. The Language of the Classroom. Columbia University, U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research Project Number 1497, 1963.

Bellon, J.J. and Jones, R. "Renewal for School Administrators-A Systematic Approach." Journal of Secondary Education, XLV, (January, 1970).

Boyer, Ernest E., Rubin, Louis, and Hardenbrook, Robert. "The Santa Barbara Coordinated Education Project." The Education Digest, 31: 4-7, October, 1965.

Brighton, Staynor. Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation. Successful School Management Series. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., pp. 12-13.

Brown, Bob Burton. "Congruity of Student Teachers' Beliefs and Practices with Dewey's Philosophy." Education Forum, XXXIII (January, 1969).

Brown, William R, Nasland, Mildred, and Dederick, Nellie. "Los Angeles City Schools - Partner in Teacher Education." The Journal of Teacher Education, XII (March, 1961), pp. 60-65.

Carmichal, Dennis, and Kallenback, Warren. "The California Teacher Development Project: An Individualized Approach to In-Service Education." Journal of Secondary Education , XLVI (January, 1971), pp. 16-20.

Chadwick, Clifton. "A Readiness for Differentiated Staffing: Instructional Management." Information Report #3, Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, State of Florida, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, November, 1969.

Chaplin, Judson. "Practice in Teaching." Harvard Educational Review, XXXIII (Winter, 1963), pp. 40-44.

Clarkson, David M. "School-College Relationships." The Arithmetic Teacher, May, 1968, pp. 447-449.

Cole, James C. "Improving Teacher Education: A Proposal for Re-experience." Remaking the World of the Career Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966, pp. 136-138.

Collaborative Effort of the SUTEC Staff. "School University Education Center." The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (February, 1967), pp. 6-13.

Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Conlin, M.R. "Supervising Teachers of the Disadvantaged." Educational Leadership, XXIV (February, 1967), pp. 393-398.

Cook, Thomas George. "A Study of In-Service Education Programs for Classroom Teachers Utilizing Instructional Television in Selected Public Schools in Michigan." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964.

Cooperative Project for Educational Development. An Inter-university Program for the Exploratory Development of Models of Planned Change to Improve Educational Systems. USOE Project No. 251. University of Michigan, 1966.

Corey, Stephen. "Introduction." In-Service Education, 56th Yearbook, NSSE, University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Dale, Joanne. "In-Service Education and the Improvement of Instruction." Journal of Secondary Education, 39: 299-302, 1964.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Performance Assessment and Performance Based Teacher Education: The Florida Plan." Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, August, 1969.

Darland, D.D. "The Profession's Quest for Responsibility and Accountability." Phi Delta Kappan , (September, 1970), pp. 41-44.

Davies, Don. "An Era of Opportunity." Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, Washington, D.C. : National Education Association, 1966, pp. 199-204.

Davies, Don. "The Teacher Numbers Game." The Education Digest, (January, 1971), pp. 1-4.

Davies, Don. "We Have Met the Enemy." Paper Read at the Tri-University Project in Elementary Education Conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, September, 1968.

DeCarlo, M. and Cleland, D. "A Reading in In-Service Education Programs for Teachers." The Reading Teacher, XXII (November, 1968), pp. 163-169.

DeLong, Greta. "Toward More Meaningful Teacher Preparation." Journal of Teacher Education, XII (Spring, 1971) pp. 15-19.

Den[illegible]. Excerpt from speech at St. Louis, Mo., Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966, pp. 84-97.

DeVita, Joseph. "A Stimulating Technique: Teachers Observe Other Teachers." Clearing House, XXXVII, 1963, pp. 549-550.

The Education Professions - 1968. Washington, D.C.: The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.

Flanders, Ned A. "Teacher Behavior and In-Service Programs." Educational Leadership, XXI (1963), pp. 25-29.

Flanders, Ned A. Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement: Studies in Interaction Analysis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research Project No. 397, 1960.

Flanders, Ned A. "Using Interaction Analysis in the In-Service Training of Teachers." Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (1962), pp. 313-316.

Flexible Staff Organization Feasibility Study. Interim Report. A Report prepared by the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, February, 1969.

Frinks, Marshall L. "A Readiness for Differentiated Staffing: Questions Relevant to Development and Training Activities." Information Report #2, Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, October, 1969.

Frost, Joe L. and Rowland, Thomas. "The Seventies: A Time for Giant Steps." The Education Digest, (February, 1970), pp. 1-4.

Gellman, Vivian. "To Effect Change in Teacher Preparation." Educational Leadership, (April, 1971), pp. 707-709.

Glatthorn, Allan A. "Students Schools, and the Tides of Change." Croft Educational Services, 1970.

Goddu, Roland. "A Hope Lost at Birth." The Journal of Teacher Education, XXII (Summer, 1971).

Goldhammer and Gerald Becker. "What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education, VI (April, 1970).

Graham, Richard. "The Teacher Corps: A Place to Begin." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (October, 1968), pp. 49-60.

Hamilton, Norman K. (ed.) Humanizing the Secondary School. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969.

Hammes, Richard and Morrison, Kenneth. A Model for Preparation of Differentiated Staff Personnel. Oshkosh, Wisconsin: Wisconsin State University, 1970.

Harris, B.M. "In-Service Growth - The Essential Requirement." Educational Leadership, XXIV (December, 1966), pp. 257-260.

Hassel, Carl W. "A Study of Certain Factors to In-Service Education in Selected School Districts in New York State." Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1960.

Hayes, Robert Bruce. "A Study of Programs of Pre-Service and In-Service Education for Cooperating School Supervising Teachers Used by Selected Teacher Institutions." University of Kansas, 1960.

Hayes, Robert B. "Viewing Imperatives for Student Teaching in 1967." Teachers College Journal, XXXIX (October, 1967).

Howard, Elizabeth. "Teacher Training and Student Change: An Analysis of Needs, Attitudes, and Performance." Doctor's thesis, Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1961.

Johnson, William D. "Microteaching: A Medium in Which to Study Teaching." The High School Journal, (November, 1967), pp. 86-92.

Kallenbach, Warren. "Micro-teaching as a Teaching Methodology." Conference on Instructional Methods and Teacher Behavior. Berkeley, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1966.

Keppel, Francis, Chaplin, Judson, and Robinson, Wade. "Recent Developments at the Harvard Graduate School of Education." High School Journal, XLIII (February, 1960), pp. 243-261.

Keppel, Francis, and Perry, Paul. "School and University: Partners in Progress." Phi Delta Kappan, XLII (January, 1961), pp. 174-80.

Klatt, Judith, and LeBaron, Walt. A Short Summary of Ten Model Teacher Education Programs. Systems Development Corporation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Ladd, Ernest T. "Tensions in School-University Collaboration." Partnership in Teacher Education, The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966, p. 104.

Lessinger, Leon. "Accountability In Public Education." Todays Education, (May, 1970), pp. 52-53.

Lewin, Charles Robert, Jr. "In-Service Education in Relation to Curriculum Development Trends and Recommended Programs in Secondary Schools." Doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, 1963.

Lowe, A. "Becoming a Teacher." Childhood Education, XLIV (December, 1967), pp. 239-244.

McCollister, John C. "A Study of Courses in Education Offered by State Colleges and Universities in Louisiana in Which In-Service Teachers Were Enrolled." Doctoral dissertation. Louisiana University, 1964, p. 251.

McDonald, F.J. and Allen D.W. Training Effects of Feedback and Modeling Procedures on Teaching Performance. Stanford, California: School of Education, Stanford University, 1967.

Meier, John H. "Rationale for and Application of Microtraining to Improve Teaching." The Journal of Teacher Education, (Summer, 1968), pp. 145-157.

Meier, John H. Remote Training of Early Childhood Educators, Title XI, Greenly, Colorado: Colorado State College, N.D.E.A. Institute, July, 1968.

Melching, W. Introducing Innovations in Instruction: Teacher Workshops in Classroom Management. Alexandria, Virginia: Resources Research Organization, November, 1970.

Mercer County Teacher Education Center. ERIC, ED. 046-868, May, 1971.

Model Programs: Childhood Education. Philadelphia: Teacher Center, Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, 1970.

Moffitt, John C. In-Service Education for Teachers. Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963, p. 107.

Moore, George E, and Talmage, Harriet. "Cooperative Progaams in Urban Education." Journal of Teacher Education, XXI (Winter, 1970), pp. 469-477.

Moore, Hollis. Excerpt from speech at Raleigh, North Carolina. Remaking the World of the Career Teacher, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966, p. 25.

Mueller, Carol-coe C. Career Development in Head Start: The Teaching and Community Service Dockets. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Spring, 1970.

Miles, Matthew. Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Mulhern, John D. "The New Emphasis in Teaching." North Central Association Quarterly, XLII (Fall, 1967).

National Education Association. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Current Practices in In-Service Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.

National Education Association. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. [illegible] of the Career Teacher: Professional Responsibility for Continuing Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964.

National Education Association. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. A Position Paper. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963.

National Education Association. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The Teacher and His Staff: Selected Demonstration Centers. St.Paul: 3 M Education Press, 1967.

Ober, Richard L. "Theory into Practice Through Classroom Observation." Florida Education Research Bulletin, Spring, 1968.

Ober, Richard L. Theory into Practice Through Systematic Observation. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Spring, 1968, p. 48.

Ogletree, J.R., Wear, P.W., Molloy, Jeanette, and Edmonds, Fred. "Program of Experimentation in Preparing Educational Supervisors." Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky, June, 1962.

Olivero, James and Buffie, Edward. Educational Manpower. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970.

Olivero, James L. "The Meaning and Application of Differentiated Staffing in Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan, (September, 1970), pp. 35-38.

Olsen, H.C. "Innovation in Supervision Today." Partnership in Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1968.

Olsen, Hans C., Barbour, Chandler, and Michalak, Daniel. "The Teaching Clinic: A Team Approach to Improved Teaching." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1971, pp. 10-15.

Pharis, William L. "In-Service Education of Elementary Principals." Department of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, April, 1966.

Pillot, Gene M. "A Conceptual Design of a System Model of Differentiated Staffing." An unpublished dissertation, University of Florida, 1970.

Purpel, David E. "Student Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education, XVIII (Spring, 1967), pp. 20-23.

Raths, Louis. "How Children Build Meanings." Childhood Education, XXXI (December, 1954), pp. 159-60.

Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America. New York: Random House, 1967.

Ridley, Agnes F. "In-Service Education and the Affective Domain." American Vocational Journal, January, 1971, pp. 46-68.

Rubin, Louis. "Authentic Teacher Growth." Educational Leadership, April, 1971, pp. 701-703.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Schild, Robert Joseph. "A Study of Certain Practices and Some Proposed Directions for In-Service Education Programs in Selected Schools of the APSS." Doctoral dissertation. Columbia University, 1964.

Schooling, H.W. "Partnership in Teacher Preparation." National Education Association Journal, May, 1962, pp. 61-62.

Schvalenberg, Richard J. Teacher Orientation Practices in Oregon Secondary Schools. University of Oregon Press, 1965.

Seyfert, Warren C. (ed.) "The Beginning Teacher." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (October, 1968), p. 330.

Shaplin, Judson T. "Practice in Teaching." Harvard Educational Review, XXXI (Winter, 1961), pp. 23-50.

Shearouse, H.S. In-Service Education to Solve Problems Incident to Desegregation of the Dual School System. Conyers Georgia: Rockdale County Public Schools, November, 1969.

Shuman, R. Baird. "Some Myths That Teachers Live By." Educational Digest, February, 1970, pp. 32-34.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1969.

Smith, E. Brooks. "Joint Responsibility." National Education Association Journal, LVII (May, 1968).

Smith, B. Othanel, Cohen, Saul B, Pearl, Arthur. Teachers For the Real World. Washington, D.C.: Association of Colleges for Teachers Education, 1969.

Soar, R.S. An Integrative Approach to Classroom Learning. Final report, Project No. 5-r11 MH 01096, University S.Carolina and Temple University, National Institute of Mental Health.

Springle, Donald. "Teacher Education Moves Out of the Ivory Tower." American Vocational Journal, January, 1971, pp. 36-37.

Taylor, B.L., Doyle, Peggy, and Link, Jeffrey. "A More Humane Teacher Education." Educational Leadership, XXVIII (April, 1971), pp. 198-200.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1967.

TTT, Final Report. San Francisco, California: San Francisco State College, San Francisco Unified Schools, September, 1969 to August 31, 1970.

VanderLinde, L.S. "Cooperative Student Teaching Centers." Partnership in Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966.

Waetjen, Walter. "Facts About Learning." Readings in Curriculum, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Waynant, Louise F. "Teachers' Strengths: Basis for Successful In-Service Experiences." Educational Leadership, April, 1971, pp. 710-713.

Westfall, Byron L. "Student Teaching Programs in Certain School Systems of the North Central Association Area." North Central Association Quarterly, XXXVII (Winter, 1963), pp. 237-245.

Wilhelms, Fred T. "Before the Beginning." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (May, 1968).

Wright, Benjamin D. and Tuska, Stanley. Student and First-Year Teachers' Attitudes Toward Self and Others. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1966.

Wulk, Jerry E. and Miller, Ralph M. "A New Approach at U.C.L.A.: Secondary Teaching Internships." The Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965).